



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/512,511	02/24/2000	Jalil Fadavi-Ardekani	FADAVI-ARDEKANI25-14-2	5581

7590 02/05/2003

Mark D. Simpson Esq.
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950

EXAMINER

PAN, DANIEL H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2183

DATE MAILED: 02/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/512,511

Applicant(s)
Fadavi-Ardekani et al.

Examiner
Pan

Art Unit
2183

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 24, 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 5, 7, and 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2183

Claims 1-8 are presented for examination.

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (b) as being anticipated by Maki (4,839,851).

As to claim 1, Maki disclosed a digital signal processing system comprising at least :

a) a parameter RAM [14] coupled to a hardware accelerator [12], the parameter RAM [14] adapted to store operating condition parameters (e.g. control words) for use by the hardware accelerator (e.g see col.3, lines 4-28, see also col.1, lines 10-24, lines 55-64, col.2, lines 1-13 for the background of the control of the hardware accelerator).

As to claim 2, Maki also included at least 1K X 16 bit RAM (e.g. see the 256 X 16 bits of the RAM cell in col.3, lines 61-67).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior

Art Unit: 2183

1 art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
2 to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
3 negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4

5 Claims 3,6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maki
6 (4,839,851) in view of Hoekstra (5,883,907).

7 As to claims 3,6, limitation of the parent claim 1 has been set forth in ~~Paragraph 4~~ ^{Page 2},
8 therefore, it will not be repeated herein. Maki did not specifically show the plurality of ADSL
9 lines as claimed. However, Hoekstra disclosed a plurality of ADSL lines [26] (e.g. see the ADSL
10 transceivers [26] in fig.1, col. 2, lines 48-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill
11 in the art to use Hoekstra in Maki for including the plurality of ADSL lines as claimed because
12 the use of Hoekstra could enhance the control capability of Maki to accept different type of
13 processing structures, such as asymmetric transmission of the data speed, at a given system
14 condition, thereby expanding the processing structure of hardware accelerator in Maki, and it
15 could be readily achieved by defining the communication parameters of ADSL, of Hoekstra into
16 the configuration file of Maki, such that the configuration parameters (e.g. data length,
17 transmission rate) could be recognizable by Maki, and because Maki also taught a parallel
18 pipeline processing to optimize the transmission rate T_p (e.g. see col.1, lines 45-52), which was
19 a suggestion of the need of using higher data rate device, and that his hardware accelerator was a
20 general purpose hardware accelerator (e.g see col.2, lines 1-16), which should be applicable to
21 any specific type of digital processing circuit, such as ADSL, and in doing so provided a
22 motivation.

D.J.
4/28/03

Art Unit: 2183

1 Claims 4 ,5,7,8 are objected as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would
2 be allowable as being reciting the specific RAM configurations of the ADSL lines, and if
3 rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any
4 intervening claims.

5 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's
6 disclosure. .

7 A)Ramseyer et al. (5,754,556) for specifically showing the teaching of hardware accelerator;
8 b)Chodnekar et al. (6,415,369) for specifically showing the teaching of ADSL.

9 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner
10 should be directed to Dan Pan, Esq. whose telephone number is 703 305 9696. The examiner
11 can normally be reached on M-F from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

12 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
13 supervisor, Dr. Chan, can be reached on (703) 305 9712. The fax phone number for the
14 organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is

15 a) before final 703 746 7239
16 b) after final 703 846 7238
17 c) customer service 703 746 7240.

18 Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
19 should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 205 3900 .
20

Application/Control Number: 09/512,511

Page 5

Art Unit: 2183

DANIEL H. PAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP

1

2

3